



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/443,038	11/18/1999	JAMES MCCROSSIN	11324/1	6686
7590	01/03/2008		EXAMINER	
SHAWN W O'DOWD KENYON & KENYON 333 W SAN CARLOS STREET SAN JOSE, CA 95110			CAMPEN, KELLY SCAGGS	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	3691
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	01/03/2008 PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1 RECORD OF ORAL HEARING
2

3 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
4

5
6 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
7 AND INTERFERENCES
8

9
10 Ex parte JAMES MCCROSSIN, DEAN HILLER,
11 and RICHARD KORNUTIK
12

13
14 Appeal 2007-1796
15 Application 09/443,038
16 Technology Center 3600
17

18
19 Oral Hearing Held: November 15, 2007
20

21
22
23 Before HUBERT LORIN, ANTON W. FETTING, DAVID B. WALKER,
24 Administrative Patent Judges

25
26 ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT:

27
28 SHAWN W. O'DOWD
29 Kenyon & Kenyon
30 333 W. San Carlos Street
31 Suite 600
32 San Jose, CA 95110

33
34

35 The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on November 15, 2007, at the
36 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia,
37 before Dominico Quattrociocchi, Free State Reporting, Inc.

1Appeal 2007-1796
2Application 09/443,038
3

1
2
PROCEEDINGS

3 JUDGE WALKER: Hello, this is Judge Walker in Hearing Room B.
4 We are ready for Calendar Number 39. Thank you.

5 MS. BEAN: Calendar Number 39, Mr. O'Dowd.

6 JUDGE LORIN: Good morning, Mr. O'Dowd.

7 MR. O'DOWD: Good morning.

8 JUDGE LORIN: This is Appeal 2007-1796.

9 MR. O'DOWD: That's correct; Mr. McCrossin. James McCrossin;
10 first named inventor.

11 JUDGE LORIN: I believe so. I believe that's correct. Yes. Alright,
12 Counsel, when you're ready. You have 20 minutes. You may proceed.

13 MR. O'DOWD: Good morning. This invention concerns providing
14 local information to users of the internet. You can type in a search --

15 JUDGE FETTING: Can you speak up a little bit? I'm having a little
16 trouble hearing.

17 MR. O'DOWD: Sure. Let me take a deep breath. What we're talking
18 about today is about providing local information over the internet. So, when
19 you type in that search for a floral shop into a regular search engine, you can
20 get floral shops for New York City, California and Tokyo as well. So we're
21 trying to provide local information. So, what is contemplated by the present
22 invention is that each individual will prepare or have prepared for them a
23 web site or web page, and you'll assign to that web site a physical location.
24 So I will create a, a web site on the system, and I will have a physical
25 location, say my house in Arlington, for example, and so my web site will
26 have an Arlington, Virginia location assigned to it. A floral shop near the

5Appeal 2007-1796
6Application 09/443,038

7

1PTO would have a location -- would have a web site, would have a location
2near the Patent Office assigned to it. By the same measure, a floral shop in
3Nebraska would also be on the server and have a location there and a user
4from Nebraska would also be. So, when I do a search for a floral shop, what
5can be done is you can compare my web site and the location that's assigned
6to it with the locations that are assigned to the web sites of the floral shop
7that's down here at the PTO and the one that's in Nebraska, and provide
8links on my website based on that relationship. So, the one that'll appear
9first, for example, would be the floral shop that's in Arlington, Virginia;
10provide that on my website -- the one that has been assigned to me. So, if
11you have a server located in New York, it will be storing all of these
12websites. New York really has no bearing whatsoever on this invention
13because it is the websites themselves that have locations assigned to them.
14The server where these websites are found can be located anywhere on earth.

15 There are two rejections here in the -- that we're appealing from. The
16first is a 112 second paragraph rejection where the Examiner is objecting to
17the language identified by a physical location as being vague. I would
18suggest to you that if you read the claim as a whole, I think that the term is
19not vague at all. Physical location should be interpreted as a place on earth.
20That, that's in line with the dictionary definitions, that's in line with the
21examples given in the specification. Reading the claim as a whole, you're
22talking about the relationship between physical locations and whether it -- or
23presenting links on a website based on a relationship between those physical
24locations. I think that the language is quite clear. As with many cases that
25come before this panel, it has been pending for quite some time and we are
26on our fourth Examiner; however, the language that's being complained of

9Appeal 2007-1796
10Application 09/443,038
11

1was vetted with one of the prior Examiners and, you know, withdrew un-
2objected to is now being objected to new. We ask that you look at that issue.
3I think that the term is clear in the claim and that the 112 second paragraph
4rejection should be reversed.

5 The -- so let's take Claim 1 as an example. So, Claim 1 is directed to
6creating or having created a number of websites. So, getting back to my
7example before, my website, the floral shop here at the PTO, the floral shop
8in Nebraska and an individual in Nebraska; each website is created. Each
9website will have a unique URL assigned to it so that the website is
10addressable through a unique URL. Also, as I've stated, each website will
11have assigned to it a physical location. One of those websites is assigned to
12me. Alright, so as set forth in the claim, it is a user's website. So it is my
13website. The physical location is what I choose, which let's say would be
14my house location in Arlington, Virginia. The final element is that you are
15going to provide links on my website -- on the user's assigned website based
16on the relationship between the location or the physical location of my
17website and the physical location of the other websites that are a part of this,
18part of this system. The Examiner is relying on two references; Ye and
19Bonnaure. Now the Ye reference refers to something called IPv6
20addressing. Okay, so --

21 JUDGE FETTING: This is the secondary reference. It's not the
22primary reference. Correct?

23 MR. O'DOWD: That is true. I'd like to go in this, in this order. The
24Ye reference is pointing out that IP addresses can have a geographic
25component to them. But, it has to be pointed out that an IP address is not a
26URL. An IP address is not a website. So an IP address is an elaborate string

13Appeal 2007-1796

14Application 09/443,038

15

1of digits; number, dot, number, dot, number, dot, number. And what Ye is
2proposing is that if I am assigned a IP address, that you will assign it to me
3based on GPS coordinants such as longitude, latitude, altitude. Assign me a
4-- I'm sorry, not a URL -- assign me an IP address that indicates my
5location. Okay. Now once you've done that, Ye talks about a couple of
6applications. One is that -- let's say I'm in Nebraska and so there's a lot of
7tornados and if there's a weather alert that says there's a tornado watch
8going on, then send out a message to those IP addresses, okay, those IP
9addresses that fit the GPS coordinants of the affected area, okay. Another
10thing that you can do it that if you are accessing a server, and a server will
11have it's own IP address associated with it, you can compare the two IP
12addresses and the server can respond only to those, you know, IP addresses
13that are, say, within a particular area of it. So for example, if the USPTO
14website here in Arlington is chosen only to respond to those who are in
15Northern Virginia, I would be able to access the PTO website while the
16individual in Nebraska would not based on a comparison of the IP address.

17 JUDGE FETTING: But a URL has a specific IP address assigned to
18it. Yes?

19 MR. O'DOWD: That's true.

20 JUDGE FETTING: So once you know a URL, if you have an IP
21address that is identified by a geographic location, the URL is in fact
22identified by that geographic location by means of the IP address.

23 MR. O'DOWD: That's true.

24 JUDGE FETTING: Okay, so that would appear to meet the
25requirement of Claim 1 that the URL is identified by a physical location.

26 MR. O'DOWD: The URL -- yes, it'll have to be in a table to assign it

17Appeal 2007-1796
18Application 09/443,038
19

1to a particular address and so if you have assigned to a person a geographic
2location within their IP address, then the URL would be, would be linked to
3that particular IP address.

4 JUDGE FETTING: Okay.

5 MR. O'DOWD: Alright, so the -- but there is more, there's more to
6the claim then, then just that feature. There is the creation of these websites,
7and the assigning of information to each website as to location and then
8selecting links to provide on a particular user's website based on a location
9relationship between these, these websites. So inYe, okay, for example, if
10I'm accessing a server in New York about a floral shop in Arlington,
11Virginia, the, the network addresses that we're talking about are mine in
12Arlington, Virginia and the network address would be the server in New
13York, and truly has no bearing whatsoever on what it is that I'm looking for.
14Again that IP address is referring to the server, that server can be anywhere.

15 The Bonnaure reference is quite similar to Ye in that Bonnaure is also
16trying to assign a location to the person that's calling into the system. So
17when you turn on the web TV system, the system calls into a central
18location. The central location is looking at the phone number that's being
19dialed, and as we know, from a phone number you can, you can pull an area
20code, you can pull an exchange and you would be able to determine the
21location of the person. Well why do they do this? Well they do this because
22the person is about to dial into internet access and they'd like to reduce cost
23as much as possible. So what they do is they take at location information
24and they're able to calculate telephone charges and provide back to the user
25a telephone number that that person should use to access the internet. Web
26TV is a set atop box, the screen of the television set becomes you're a -- like

21Appeal 2007-1796

22Application 09/443,038

23

1your computer monitor for accessing, accessing the internet. So, so when
2you look at the two references, the two references are talking about how to
3access, how to access the internet, but both are focusing on a network
4address for, for the user. Ye is focusing on the IP address and Bonnaure is
5focusing on the telephone number that is being used to dial into the system.

6 JUDGE FETTING: Well, that's -- but it's --Bonnaure is very specific
7that it's mapping that to a physical location; an address, and using that
8address as a vehicle for targeting the services and sites that are then
9presented back to the, to the, to the user.

10 MR. O'DOWD: Okay.

11 JUDGE FETTING: So, I mean, it does discuss the data -- the
12geographic data base. It happens to use the telephone number as a, as an
13index in that data base, but it's -- I mean to me, it's pretty clear that it's
14keeping a geographical data base.

15 MR. O'DOWD: Okay, again there I have no assigned website to the
16user that's accessing the system.

17 JUDGE FETTING: And that appears to be the issue.

18 MR. O'DOWD: There is, there is no, there is no website that it's
19being assigned to the user. There is no, there is no physical location
20assigned to such a website since there isn't a website assigned to the user.

21 JUDGE FETTING: There's a location assigned to the user, there's
22just not a website assigned to the user.

23 MR. O'DOWD: So you assign a website to the user; that's missing.
24Assign a location to that website; that's missing.

25 JUDGE FETTING: Right.

26 MR. O'DOWD: then presenting links on that website based on a

25Appeal 2007-1796

26Application 09/443,038

27

1relationship between the location of that website with the other websites that
2are on this, this server; that is missing. In Claim 1, there are three elements
3to the claim and, you know, all three elements are missing.

4 JUDGE FETTING: They're missing because there's no website for
5the user,

6 MR. O'DOWD: There is no website for the, there is no website for
7the user. That's correct. There's also -- remember that we're talking about
8comparing a relationship between the location that's assigned to a website,
9the user's website and a location that's assigned to the website of the, you
10know, of the, of the -- one of the other individual websites that are on, that
11are on this system. And, you know, so that is, that is an additional feature
12to, you know, to keep in mind. There isn't anything in Bonnaure that
13suggests that you're looking at a network address to say, I'll present this
14information to the user. My, my network address comes back with an
15Arlington, Virginia location. How is that going to be used to provide local
16information? Perhaps it's used by searching for Arlington, Virginia in
17metafiles in a, in a particular website, but it's not being used to take another,
18another party's website and say this is the, this is an Arlington, Virginia
19website because it has that assign Arlington to it. Present a link on my web
20page to that particular site.

21 JUDGE FETTING: Where does it say, presented on the webpage?

22 JUDGE LORIN: It say's here --

23 JUDGE FETTING: On said user website. Right. Okay.

24 JUDGE LORIN: Counsel, I've got a couple questions here before
25you continue. Can you explain to me by being identified by a physical
26location? What does that mean? You said creating a plurality of first

29Appeal 2007-1796
30Application 09/443,038
31

1websites. You know, just reading it off the top of my head, I'm thinking of
2a webmaster who sits there and designs websites.

3 MR. O'DOWD: Right.

4 JUDGE LORIN: Right, he's just designing a website and on this
5website -- well for each website that this webmaster designs, the webmaster
6will, will find a unique URL and, and, and that website will be labeled as
7such. What do you mean when you then say, each of said first websites
8being identified by physical location?

9 MR. O'DOWD: As filed, it was associating the physical location with
10the URL. That was objected to by, by the Examiner.

11 JUDGE LORIN: What do you mean by associated? Do you mean
12that the URL actually mentions the location or --

13 MR. O'DOWD: That, that you have a location in that, that is related
14to the, to the URL such as --

15 JUDGE LORIN: Like .US or .CA?

16 MR. O'DOWD: No, like, like a, like a data base entry --
17corresponding entry. URL which would be in the example here my home
18phone number would be the .abra.com, I believe is the example that's given,
19okay, is my personal website on the system table look up would have a
20corresponding entry in Virginia for that website.

21 JUDGE LORIN: So this, this step is saying creating first websites
22being identified in a data base. In other words, you're corresponding a
23website with a physical location. You're corresponding the two?

24 MR. O'DOWD: Corresponding the two, that's right.

25 JUDGE LORIN: This identification is identified. It's not that
26identified on the website. It's not that it's identified by a brick and mortar

33Appeal 2007-1796
34Application 09/443,038
35

1store or something of that sort.

2 MR. O'DOWD: The, the patent specification tries to keep that open
3because as presented in dependent claims, you can change the location. So,
4for example, I have to do several trips to my California office, okay, and so
5when I go to California and I need a flower shop the information that's being
6provided providing me a link to the one at the PTO is, is useless to me. By
7changing the location of the, the physical location assigned to my website to
8California -- San Jose, California, now when I'm looking for a floral shop, I
9will get a link to the Silicon Valley florist.

10 JUDGE LORIN: Right, but what you're discussing is a search
11technique. You're searching for websites for flower shops in Arlington.
12Right? This -- what I'm reading here is you're creating a first website and if
13I understand you correctly, you're saying creating a first website being
14identified by physical location. Now that I understand you, what you're
15saying is, you're creating a website, a webpage like we have here in front of
16our screen and on the screen is the name of the location.

17 MR. O'DOWD: In the example in the, in the spec, the actual location
18can be presented on the webpage, but I don't think that that's necessary.
19The identification is that you have the computer system knows that the
20location for that website for purposes of providing links which is what I
21mean by reading the claim in its entirety. Providing -- for providing links
22the location for that website is Arlington, Virginia.

23 JUDGE LORIN: Okay, that leads me to another question.

24 MR. O'DOWD: Alright.

25 JUDGE LORIN: The last step in the claim calls for selecting links as
26you say based on a relationship between the physical locations. Now does

37Appeal 2007-1796
38Application 09/443,038
39

1this cover a webmaster picking links and just creating a webpage with links
2with a physical location that, that corresponds with one on the, on the first
3websites?

4 MR. O'DOWD: So, the, the example we have is we have four
5websites total; an individual in Arlington, an individual in Nebraska, a floral
6shop in Arlington and a floral ship in Nebraska. So because of the locations
7that are assigned to each of those websites, the link that's going to be
8provided to me for a floral shop will be the one in Arlington based on the
9relationship between the physical locations assigned to the websites.

10 JUDGE LORIN: I think the difficulty I'm having here is that you're,
11you're talking in terms of this method automatically and using a computer it,
12it seems to understand what the links are required knowing the physical
13location of the first websites, but the claim is much broader then that. Isn't
14it? I mean the claim is a method of providing information, collecting
15information, creating websites, assigning websites and selecting links. In
16fact, I don't even see a computer here doing any of these steps. Is that not
17true?

18 MR. O'DOWD: Well, it does say that we are creating plurality of
19websites at the first at the first computer system.

20 JUDGE LORIN: Yeah, but why -- don't, don't -- I mean people have
21been doing that since 1994. I mean isn't that just a matter of someone just
22creating a website. I mean I understand what you're trying to say with
23regard to prior art, but this -- the questions I'm raising to you is a claim
24construction issue.

25 MR. O'DOWD: Sure.

26 JUDGE LORIN: Which on many of these cases I see is missing. The

41Appeal 2007-1796
42Application 09/443,038
43

1panels don't bring it up and the Examiners don't bring it up. But this case
2seems to be very simple. You have collecting, creating, assigning and
3selecting, which anyone can do who understands how to make, make a
4website.

5 MR. O'DOWD: Creating websites is certainly well known in the art
6prior to, to the filing date of this, this invention. I think that the, the feature
7of assigning to a website a location is what is, is quite different. It might,
8you know, be present now, but, but at that particular time, you know, the Ye
9-- the proposal by Ye has never been implemented. When you access
10Comcast, if that's your cable provider at home, Comcast has a string or a
11series of, of internet addresses and assigns them to you almost randomly.
12And, and so that location information is quite missing. The early days of the
13internet was to provide one website for, you know, for a massive
14corporation, such as Toyota or Starbucks and the location information for
15that website would be, you know, would be missing completely. Starbucks
16is an international company. What Starbucks could do is create on the
17system a website for the Starbucks that's located on Dulany Street and that
18is the website on the system. And so when you're looking for a coffee shop,
19the location of my website is Arlington, Virginia. The location -- the
20physical location assigned to that Dulany Street Starbucks is, is the
21relationship that we're looking, but it is assigned to the website and the
22relationship is what we're focusing on to provide links on my webpage -- on
23my website to provide local information to the user. You still have
24questions?

25 JUDGE LORIN: No, I'm fine, I'm fine. Thank you. Thank you for
26answering.

45Appeal 2007-1796
46Application 09/443,038
47

1 MR. O'DOWD: Alright.

2 JUDGE FETTING: I guess I'm -- Am I correct that the only real
3 issue in this case is the absence of a user website? I mean it's -- in that last
4 sentence, I mean -- if you didn't have user websites, you certainly have
5 selecting links to a plurality to other websites. For presentation based upon
6 relationship between the physical location identified by those websites and
7 the user's physical location, it would seem that that is dead spot on shown
8 by the, the PCT reference. It's just that that one doesn't present it on a, on a
9 user webpage or is that accurate?

10 MR. O'DOWD: I don't think so and I'll tell you why. The -- , in
11 Bonnaure which is the PCT reference, the information might be, might be
12 tailored to, to the individual, but a particular website does not have assigned
13 to it a physical location to be compared and contrasted with the, with the
14 physical location of the user. It is unclear to me, at least, how that
15 information is going to be provided. It could be provided by simply doing a
16 search for, you know, floral shops in --

17 JUDGE FETTING: Well, Bonnaure is clearly presenting links to
18 places that are geographically close to the user back to the user. Usually you
19 request a client's cell phone number, the service provider web or web TV
20 server can select an appropriate supplier or warehouse closest to the client's
21 location. And then later on, for example, a specific menu of items
22 associated with particular geographic locations can be offered for a
23 particular clients based upon the, the requesting client's telephone number.
24 So it's, it's clearly creating links that are predicated upon the relationship of
25 the geographic location of the people providing the services compared with
26 the person making the request. So again, it, it seems that the only real

49Appeal 2007-1796
50Application 09/443,038
51

1distinction is, is using a user's web, website as the platform for, for, for
2providing that display.

3 MR. O'DOWD: But the, the assignment of the physical location to
4the website is not necessarily linked to the network address. And so the
5system that's provided here is -- it has greater flexibility and better, better
6advantages and that you will find such features in the dependent claims and
7that is argued in the Appeal Brief, but the --

8 JUDGE FETTING: Well, it certainly wants to, at least, be identified
9by that physical location from them being able to present them back.

10 MR. O'DOWD: But the physical -- again physical location, of course,
11is the physical location of where I am as opposed to the physical location of
12my webpage or my website.

13 JUDGE FETTING: Yeah, well that, that distinction is not -- I don't
14see that distinction in the claim. It just says identified by a physical location.

15 MR. O'DOWD: But the last, the last step is selecting links to a
16plurality of said first websites other than the user website.

17 JUDGE FETTING: Again, that seems to be the distinction; if we
18don't have a user's website.

19 MR. O'DOWD: That's true, we don't have, we don't have a user's
20website and we don't have assigning of physical location to the, to such a
21website for the purposes of selecting links for presentation to the user.

22 JUDGE FETTING: Okay, that'll be all my questions.

23 JUDGE LORIN: You have any more comments, Counselor?

24 MR. O'DOWD: I do not. Of course, refer you back to our Appeal
25Brief and I thank you very much for your time.

26 JUDGE FETTING: Thank you, Counselor.

53Appeal 2007-1796

54Application 09/443,038

55

1 JUDGE LORIN: Thank you, we'll take your comments under
2advisement. Thank you.

3 (Whereupon, the proceedings concluded.)